Public Works (1906) Department.

G.O., No. 756 }
757 } I

DATED 10/7/ 1906.

Print
110/14 copies of G.O.
2 3/2 copies of letter with docket at the back for the G. of I.
80 copies of letter to
13-7

[Despatch Abstract.]

Uttangudi tank, Periyar Project.

Ordered that the G. of I. be addressed on the subject of the classification of ~~maintenance~~ expenditure on an estimate for improving the ——

Uttangudi tank, Periyar Project.

Addressing the G. of I. on the subject of the classification of expenditure on an estimate for improving the ——

17

P. W. 36.
300—19-5-06

Indexed 11/7/06

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	441-422) 8.5.56						

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Recd.	1906.	*Enclosures*
Regd.		*Spare copies*

G.O., No. 756 I., 10th July 1906.

Uttangudi tank, Periyar Project

Ordered that the Government of India be addressed on the subject of the classification of expenditure on an estimate for improving the —.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

READ—the following papers:—

I

G.O., No. 441 I., dated 8th May 1905.

ABSTRACT.—An estimate, amounting to Rs. 3,815, for improving the Uttangudi tank connected with the Periyár Project, sanctioned, and a copy of the Proceedings ordered to be forwarded to the Government of India.

II

Letter—from Mr. SIDNEY PRESTON, C.I.E., Secretary to the Government of India, Department of Revenue and Agriculture (Civil Works).
To—the Joint Secretary to the Government of Madras, Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch.
Dated—Simla, the 21st June 1905.
No.—801-I.

With reference to your endorsement No. 442 I., dated 8th May 1905, reporting sanction to an estimate, amounting to Rs. 3,815, for improving the Uttangudi tank connected with the Periyár Project chargeable to 49. Capital, I am directed to point out that the total cost of renewing the two sluices is less than Rs. 1,000, and should under the rule in paragraph 2157, Volume II, Public Works Department Code, appear to be chargeable to the Revenue Account of the Project.

Order—No. 756 I., dated 10th July 1906.

The following letter will be sent to the Government of India.

[Here enter No. 757 I., dated 10th July 1906.]

(True Extract.)

C. A. SMITH,
Ag. Joint Secretary to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation,
,, Examiner, Public Works Accounts,
,, Superintending Engineer, II Circle,
} with copy of letter.

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Recd. } 1906. *Enclosures*

Regd. *Spare copies*

Letter, No. 757 I., 10th July 1906.

Uttangudi tank, Periyar Project

Addressing the Government of India on the subject of the classification of expenditure on an estimate for improving the —.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

LETTER—from

C. A. SMITH, ESQ.,
Ag. Joint Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department,
Irrigation Branch,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

I regret that so long a delay should have occurred in forwarding a reply to your letter No. 801 I., dated 21st June 1905, referring to the classification of expenditure on an estimate for improving Uttangudi tank, Periyár Project.

2. In reply I am desired to point out that similar sanctions have been made by this Government and communicated to the Government of India without exception being taken—*vide* Nos. 1142–1143 I., dated 20th October 1904, and No. 1275 I., dated 15th November 1904.

3. As the component works of tanks and distributaries are individually small, a decision to treat each work as a separate entity, when a scheme of general improvement is submitted, will lead to a large increase in working expenses contrary to the wishes of the Government of India as expressed in your letter No. 41/A.-I., dated 20th February 1893, and will also largely increase the work of accounting for the expenditure.

4. It is difficult to say where the matter might stop, as a sluice in a tank is no more a separate work in itself than is a pipe sluice in a channel and an estimate may well contain a hundred of the latter.

5. In the present instance also the provisions of paragraph 2157 of the Public Works Department Code do not appear to apply as the cost of the old sluices to be reconstructed were not charged to the Periyár Project, but apart from this, I am to ask for a general ruling to the effect that component parts of a general scheme of improvement when submitted as one estimate, should, for purposes of accounts, be treated as one work and that, in consequence of such a ruling, the proposal of this Government to charge to whole cost of improving the Uttangudi tank to Capital may be approved.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

LETTER—from

C. A. SMITH, ESQ.,
Ag. Joint Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Public Works Department,
Irrigation Branch,

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA,
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

SIR,

I regret that so long a delay should have occurred in forwarding a reply to your letter No. 801 I., dated 21st June 1905, referring to the classification of expenditure on an estimate for improving Uttangudi tank, Periyár Project.

2. In reply I am desired to point out that similar sanctions have been made by this Government and communicated to the Government of India without exception being taken—*vide* Nos. 1142–1143 I., dated 20th October 1904, and No. 1275 I., dated 15th November 1904.

3. As the component works of tanks and distributaries are individually small, a decision to treat each work as a separate entity, when a scheme of general improvement is submitted, will lead to a large increase in working expenses contrary to the wishes of the Government of India as expressed in your letter No. 41/A.-I., dated 20th February 1893, and will also largely increase the work of accounting for the expenditure.

4. It is difficult to say where the matter might stop, as a sluice in a tank is no more a separate work in itself than is a pipe sluice in a channel and an estimate may well contain a hundred of the latter.

5. In the present instance also the provisions of paragraph 2157 of the Public Works Department Code do not appear to apply as the cost of the old sluices to be reconstructed were not charged to the Periyár Project, but apart from this, I am to ask for a general ruling to the effect that component parts of a general scheme of improvement when submitted as one estimate, should, for purposes of accounts, be treated as one work and that, in consequence of such a ruling, the proposal of this Government to charge to whole cost of improving the Uttangudi tank to Capital may be approved.

6. I am further to point out that, in somewhat analogous cases in the then Railway Branch, the Government of India in their letter No. 27/A.R., dated 11th January 1897, adverted to in G.O., No. 73-R., dated 1st February 1897, passed a ruling in the sense now desired by this Government.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. A. SMITH,

Ag. Joint Secretary to Government,

Irrigation Branch.

Ootacamund,

10th July 1906.

E. I. Form No. 1. I&E PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

classification of expenditure on an estimate for improving the Ettayapuram tank Periyar Project IRRIGATION BRANCH.

A

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Hay P. Ammomattakat G.O. No 441 I d 8 May 1905 READ again the following

Read also

Print Letter from the Government of India No.801-I dated 21st June 1905

Order. No 756 I dt 10/7/06

5.7.06 Irrign Asst The following letter will be - sent to the Government of India

To

The Chief Engr. for Irrgn
" Examiner P.W.Accounts.
" Supg.Engineer, II Circle. } with copy of letter

DESPATCHED 27 JUL 1906

9/7/06

Issue

5/7/06.

DI

Letter No 757 2 I 20/7/06

4-3

To

The Secretary to the Govt.of India
P. W. D.

Sir,

I regret that so long a delay -- should have occurred in forwarding a - reply to your letter No.801 I dated - 21st June 1905 referring to the classification of expenditure on an estimate for improving Uttangudi Tank Periyar Project.

pp 2-3 of file

2. In reply I am desired to point - out that similar sanctions have been made by this Government and communicated to the Government of India without exception being taken, vide No.1142-3 I dated 20th October 1904 and 1275-I dated 15th November 1904.

Flag N
" G

3. As the component works of tanks and distributaries are individually small, a decision to treat each work as a separate entity, when a scheme of - general improvement is submitted will lead to a large increase in working - expenses contrary to the wishes of the Government of India as expressed in your letter No.41/A-I dated 20th Feby. 1893 and will also largely increase the work of accounting for the expenditure.

Printer in Go. 2480/22.3.93 Flag Q

4. It is difficult to say where the matter might stop, as a sluice in a tank is no more a separate work in itself - than is a pipe sluice in a channel and an estimate may well contain a hundred of the latter.

3

58

5. In the present instance also the provisions of para 2157 of the P. W. D. Code do not appear to apply as the cost of the old sluices to be reconstructed were not charged to the Periyar Project but apart from this I am to ask for a general ruling to the effect that component parts of a general scheme of -- improvement when submitted as one -- estimate should for purposes of accounts be treated as one work & that in consequence of such a ruling the proposal of this Govt to charge the whole cost of improving the Uttangudy Tank to Capital may be approved.

6. I am further to point out that in somewhat analagous cases in the then Railway Branch the Government of India in their letter No.27/AR dated 11th January 1897 addressed to in G.O.No. 73-R dated 1st February 1897 passed a ruling in the sense now desired by - this Government.

Flag V.

DESPATCHED
1 AUG 1906

TWESS
3/7/06

AS
3/7/06

5.7.06

4

1,000—22-3-05.

NOTES.

From India 801/21-6-05.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
IRRIGATION BRANCH

E. I.

This may be forwarded to C. for remarks but if an est^e for improvements to a tank or channel is to be split up into its component parts I think every item will have to be sanctioned as a separate est^e and this will cause an enormous increase in Div^l and Subdiv^l accounts, A tank is a single work with component parts & all estes having reference to it should be treated as such, you might almost with equal reason separate the

vide PWC 6646/05

2

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
3- JUL 1905
No. 48601 B

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

gates from a lock

F.W.C.S.

29/6/05

The letter from India
It can be sent to C
as proposed.

C.A.
29.6.05

To C no.

F.W.C.S.
29.

P. W. D. IRRIGATION.
U. O. No. 262 D
Dated 29. 6. 1905.

No. 3487 $\frac{B}{BK}$ dated 7th July 1905.

To

E.I.

1. Under Code II 2157 the portion of the estimate relating to the construction of the two masonry sluices in replacement of existing works, is chargeable to Revenue.

2. As to the question of what portions of a general estimate should come under the limitations of the para quoted, I think the general idea is, that, to any work which can be estimated for separately (whether this separation is actually effected or whether, as a matter of convenience, its estimated

cost

3

cost is included in a general estimate) the Rs.1,000/- test applies in deciding the correct allocation of its cost. (I am of course referring here only to works on an open project.).

3. But not only is the construction of the two masonry sluices under Code II 2157 a Revenue charge, but under Code II 2156(a), the cost of improving the weir and of constructing a front head for sluice No. 2 is also apparently debitable to Revenue.

4. They have a rule similar to that embodied in the Code paras quoted, in railway working. But they also have a ruling (see India's 27.A.R. of 11th January 1897 circulated with G.O. 73-R of 1st February 1897) under which, -- several works which individually cost less than Rs.1,000/- each, may, if of a similar nature or if undertaken in furtherance of the same general idea, be grouped together and the 1,000/- test is applied to the aggregate cost of the group, in deciding as to the proper -- allocation. I think the present is an instance in which the principle of grouping recognized in the Railway Branch might very properly be applied to the Irrigation Branch as well. But before it can be made applicable, the sanction of the Government of India will have to be obtained.

Flag V

5. Until that sanction is given, the entire estimated cost of improving the Uttangudi Tank (except compensation for land) is apparently debitable to Revenue.

4 Revenue.

Offg. C.

D.E.

Altho' there have been no specific orders from India in regard to the principle of grouping referred to by the Gr. being adhered to in the case of sanctions accorded in the Irrign branch under "Open Capital rules", the principle has nevertheless been followed in this branch. Please see G.O's

× flag 9 / # " X

No. 1142-I and 1275-I, dated 20 Oct. + 15 Nov. 1904 respectively. All works connected with a tank or channel, viz a head sluice, irrigation sluices, outlets etc have been grouped together and sanctioned hitherto under the Capital account instead of each individual work costing less than Rs 1000 being sanctioned under the Reve account.

The present is the only case

5

in which the Govt of India has pointed out the necessity to sanction separately individual works costing less than Rs1000 each forming a general estimate for a work, but this procedure will unnecessarily increase work everywhere without any corresponding advantage.

For orders whether the Govt of India may be addressed for a reconsideration of their decision in question

E. G.

[initials] 23.7.05 It seems necessary from the point of view of reducing office work alone that a strong representation should be made to allow the existing practice

6

to continue

The component works of both tanks and distributaries are largely individually small & a decision to consider each one as a separate entity will result in much extra work & involve unfair charges to working expenses. Practically almost all expenditure on remodelling & realigning distributaries would have to come out of revenue & this is likely to be a heavy item in the near future.

FWSS

26/7/05.

7

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

A draft to India may be drawn up on the lines indicated in C's note.

G. J.
27.7.05

8

P.W.D., Irrigation.

From the Government of India No.864-I, dated 5th July 1905.

D.I.

With reference to para 2 of the letter from "India," it is submitted that on a similar observation made by them in a case connected with the Uttangudi tank, Periyar project, the remarks of the Examiner of P.W.Accounts have been invited. For orders whether this case may be linked with the above and await the reply from the Examiner.

G.O. No. 412 d 8.5.05
Flag B

asn
11.7.05

11/7/05.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.
Irrigation Branch.

The delay in disposing of India's no 801 d^d 21.6.05 is the most disgraceful that has come across my notice.

~~That~~ Neither this nor 864 d^d 5.7.05 have to my remembrance been entered on the Un Ref. list.

There is no reason at all why no 801 should not have been replied to as directed by Mr Garrett a year ago nor why five months delay occurred in asking S. E for the information required to reply to no 864.

The two cases are absolutely separate, and there is not the least reason for making one of them.

Letters from India require to be replied to by letter & not by orders forwarded.

The whole case shows that a better man is required to exercise general supervision over the office see that registers are kept

up (had this been done such things could not have happened) & keep the office generally up to the mark. M.E.I does his best & works I know very hard but ~~with~~ the present amount of work, which does not seem likely to decrease, is too much for him or any one else. There should be a Registrar and a Deputy Registrar or a Manager and a Dep. Manager, at present the Manager has no time to do anything but put up cases & drafts & there is no one to give a general eye to things.

There was a similar case the other day of a delay of ~~many~~ five months in a letter to Mysore which Lord Ampthill desired to be redrafted; neither of them ~~were~~ are luckily important matters but it is only a matter of time till a really important question is lost sight of, I don't think I am a very slow worker though

11

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation Branch.

I may miss points occasionally & I can hardly get through my work between 11 a.m & 6 p.m with a 10 minutes interval so I cannot relieve M.E.I more than I do

No arrears [illegible] 27/6

[signature]

26/6/06.

The delay now brought to notice is very unsatisfactory & the whole question of the working of the office must be looked into with a view to preventing such delays in future

[initials]

27/6/06

D.I.

Draft reply to India No 106 approved but I do not find any disposal of India's No [illegible] of 5/7/05.

[initials]

27/6/06

H.C.

The original converted into a letter as noted in pencil will do please retype

Herewith both typed

[signature]

27/6.

Approved [initials] 27/6

D.I.

2 Draft letters to India [illegible]

for orders of reply to India's

[illegible] for orders of [illegible]

12

48

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation Branch.

H. E. The Governor

FWSS

28/6/06.

I have noted in pencil certain alterations in the drafting wh. I think are desirable.
The Paragraphs shd. be numbered.

(It seems necessary to issue an order modifying G.O. 484 I 22. May '05 & 494 I. 24 May 05)

[illegible] 30.6.06.

DS

The last para of the present order supersedes G.O. no 484. I d 22.5.04.

[illegible] 2/7/06

FWSS. This is the letter to India & a separate order is necessary. i.e. the conditions may be introduced in the order to forward the letter to India [illegible]
The drafts had better go again to H-E for approval

[illegible] 3/7

G.O. No. 756 I 10. 7. 06.

13

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation Branch.

Two Cases

Order & letters to India revised as directed are submitted

FWSS

4/7/06

H. E. The Governor

G. 5.7.06.

658
8